

REMARKS

Claims 15-45 are currently pending in the application and stand rejected based upon the Office Action dated July 16, 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 15-24, 26-34, and 36-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)(2) as being anticipated by Downing et al. (US 6,289,335 B1) (Downing hereafter). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 15 recites the following limitations:

selecting one or more of said database recovery logs to access;
establishing a view of said one or more database recovery logs;
insulating said view from a format of said one or more database
recovery logs;
issuing a database statement to query said view; and
retrieving data from said one or more database recovery logs in
response to said database statement.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited Downing reference does not anticipate claim 15 since it does not disclose each and every one of these claim limitations. For example, Downing does not disclose the claim element “selecting one or more of said database recovery logs to access.”

Downing is directed to a novel approach for refreshing snapshots that include subqueries. A snapshot is essentially a set of data constructed from a master table. The snapshot may be defined using a SQL query, where that SQL query contains a nested query or “subquery” (e.g., as shown in Downing at col. 2, lines 23-24). Downing’s inventive approach identifies modifications to master tables such that efficient refreshes of the snapshots can be performed. The Downing approach uses “master logs” to support refreshes of subquery snapshots.

The Office Action, at page 2, states that the master log described in Downing should be interpreted to be the same as the term “recovery log” as presently claimed. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Downing reference just simply does not disclose that the master

logs are recovery logs. In fact, the term “recovery” does not appear anywhere in the Downing reference. Indeed, the Downing reference, at col. 6 line 55, is very clear that the purpose of the master logs is to support subquery snapshots -- not for recovery purposes. For at least this reason, the Downing reference does not disclose selection of one or more of database recovery logs to access as presently claimed, since Downing does not make any indication that the master log is a recovery log.

Moreover, Downing does not disclose “establishing a view of said one or more database recovery logs” and “insulating said view from a format of said one or more database recovery logs” as presently claimed in claim 15. The Office Action states that these claim elements are disclosed in Downing in figures 5(a)-(c). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Even assuming the master log is a recovery log (which is not correct based upon the reasons described above), Applicants note that figures 5(a)-(c) of Downing do not establish that a view of the master logs is being established as claimed. As presently claimed, a “view” of a log is recited as a separate and distinct element from the recovery log. Figures 5(a)-(c) of Downing only show the master log itself, and do not show a separate view that is established for the master log (see Downing at col. 7, lines 6-8 (emphasis added)):

FIGS. 4–6 illustrate a series of modifications a user might make to a master table and the corresponding entries recording in a master log. FIGS. 4(a), 4(b), and 4(c) illustrate a

Applicants further note that figures 5(a)-(c) of Downing do not disclose “insulating said view from a format of said one or more database recovery logs” as claimed in claim 15. Even assuming that the figures 5(a)-(c) show views of recovery logs (which is not correct based upon the reasons described above), Applicants note that there is no disclosure within Downing that state or suggest that the structures of figures 5(a)-(c) provide insulation from the format of the master logs. In fact, it is quite clear that the structures in figures 5(a)-(c) do the opposite and actually correspond to the structure of the master logs (see Downing at col. 7, lines 6-8).

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is allowable over the Downing reference. For at least these same reasons, Applicants submit that claims 16-24, 26-34, and 36-44 are likewise allowable over the Downing reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The Office action has rejected claims 25, 35, and 45 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Downing reference. Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 15, claims 25, 35, and 45 are not rendered obvious by the Downing reference.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.


If the Commissioner determines that additional fees are due or that an excess fee has been paid, the Patent Office is authorized to debit or credit (respectively) Deposit Account No. 50-4047, billing reference no. 7011443001.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 14, 2008

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
Telephone: (650) 849-4400
Telefax: (650) 849-4800

By:


Gerald Chan
Registration No.: 51,541